



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,280	06/20/2003	Helmut Muckter	MUCKTER-2	6448
20151	7590	11/01/2006		EXAMINER
HENRY M FEIEREISEN, LLC				WILLSE, DAVID H
350 FIFTH AVENUE				
SUITE 4714			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10118				3738

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/601,280	MUCKTER, HELMUT	
	Examiner Dave Willse	Art Unit 3738	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4-6,8,10-15,17,19-22 and 24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 4-6,8,10-15,17,19-22 and 24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

The Applicant has again failed to identify what particular locations in the foreign priority applications provide support for the revisions to the specification (Office action of May 24, 2006: page 3, lines 4-6) and **must** do so in response to instant Office action.

The copy of claim 22 does not comply with 37 CFR 1.121(c) in that claim 22 has not, in fact, been amended relative to the version of claim 22 in the Amendment filed on March 15, 2006.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5, 12, and 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The ratio of free flow cross-sections being 80% (claim 12, line 2) yet also 50% (claim 11, line 3) is contradictory. In claim 5, the range of ratios is broader than the single ratio value implicit in claim 4 (from which claim 5 depends); thus, claim 5 is confusing as to the scope. In claim 22, line 1, “the motor” lacks a proper antecedent basis.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 17, 19-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Goldowsky, US 6,068,588. Figure 5 illustrates a pump housing **22** accommodating an impeller **50**, a first vascular connection **10a** formed integral with one housing end **22b**, and a second vascular connection **10b** formed integral with the other housing end **22c**. The vascular connections **10a** and **10b** are constructed so as to be capable of direct attachment to a blood vessel through suturing (column 2, lines 18-20). Regarding claim 17: column 2, lines 33-36. Regarding claim 22, attention is directed to rotary motor **52** (Figure 5). Regarding claim 24, the inlet and outlet tubes **10a** and **10b** are viewed as vascular prostheses because they serve as elements of the cardiovascular system of a patient.

Claims 19-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Jarvik, US 4,994,078. Figures 7 and 29 show a pump housing accommodating impeller blades **502** and having ends *capable* of direct attachment at two locations of a blood vessel. The inflow vascular graft or prosthesis **70** serves as one of the vascular connections and is constructed so as to be directly suturable to the blood vessel (column 13, lines 60-64), and the same is true for the outflow vascular graft or prosthesis **72** (column 13, lines 64-67).

Claims 8, 10-12, 19-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau et al., US 6,116,862, in view of Jarvik, US 4,994,078. The embodiment of Figure 3 possesses all the features set forth in current claim 21 except, possibly, for vascular connections constructed for attachment to the blood vessel through suturing. To install the embodiment of Figure 3 for interposition in a blood vessel via suturing to prosthetic vascular grafts mechanically affixed to respective inlet **12** and outlet **18** (a procedure well known in the art, as seen from the Jarvik patent discussed above) would have been obvious in order to replace diseased vascular

tissue, to ensure a proper fit with inlet **12** and outlet **18**, and/or to prevent tissue trauma potentially arising from mechanically connecting the natural blood vessel itself directly to inlet **12** and outlet **18**, with the ordinary practitioner having been left to devise an appropriate implantation scheme and having been further motivated by the apparent suturing at ports **43** and **43a** (Figures 2a and 2b) in the first illustrated embodiment and by the explicit reference to Jarvik in Rau et al. at column 1, lines 8-16. Regarding claim 10, the webs **53** and **54** are *capable* of housing cables for the transmission of electrical current, whether or not such was the intent; in fact, such a configuration would have been inherent because passage **17** (column 2, lines 47-48) of the first embodiment (Figure 1) does not exist in the embodiment of Figure 3.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau et al. in view of Jarvik as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Chardack, US 4,957,504. Rau et al. lack a second pump housing with an impeller and a motor. Chardack teaches two parallel pumps for effecting various types of synchronized pumping (column 5, line 54 et seq.). To similarly arrange a second blood pump in parallel with the first in the invention of Rau et al. would have been obvious in order to achieve various combinations of continuous or pulsatile flow and/or to simply provide a redundant pump as a backup, with further motivation having been provided by both references being directed to ventricular assist via rotary pumping. Regarding claim 14, an adaptable connection device would have been obvious from the harness **78** of Chardack in order to facilitate control of the two pumps (Chardack: column 5, lines 54-62). Regarding claim 15, one of the motors is functionally *capable* of running in an opposite direction by reversing the polarity of its electric power source.

Claims 4-6, 19-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen et al., US 4,688,998. Figures 3 and 7-9, for example, illustrate all the elements except for suturable vascular connections. However, vascular prosthetic connections constructed for suturing would have been obvious, if not inherent, to one of ordinary skill in view of column 7, lines 10-12; column 9, lines 3-5 and 16-18; Figure 4; etc.

The Applicant's remarks have been reviewed. The term "integral" (e.g., claim 21, line 7) was held not to be limited to a fabrication of the parts from a single piece of metal, but was inclusive of other means of maintaining the parts fixed together as a single unit (*In re Larson et al.*, 144 USPQ 347). "Integral" is sufficiently broad to embrace constructions united by such means as fastening and welding (*In re Hotte*, 177 USPQ 326). Other remarks are adequately addressed in the grounds of rejection presented above.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US 4,173,796: electric cable 6 in Figure 2.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Willse whose telephone number is 571-272-4762 and who is generally available Monday through Thursday and sometimes on Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Dave Willse
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3738